

REMARKS

This Response is a submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claims 1-33 and 40-45 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, claims 1-22, 26-30, 32, 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,164,827 to Paff. Claims 23-25, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Paff in view of published U.S. patent application Pub. No. 2001/0052131 to Hobson et al. Claims 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Paff in view of U.S. Patent 5,745,126 to Jain. Applicants traverse the rejections as follows.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree that the claims are unpatentable in view of the cited prior art, the claims have been amended in order to expedite allowance. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the master control unit determines the parameters for each of the slave variable pointing camera systems based on both parameters of the master variable pointing camera system and “mapping data between the master variable pointing camera system and the slave variable pointing camera systems.” Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the mapping data includes:

- data regarding the geometric relationship of the camera systems to the scene;
- data regarding the relationship between the zoom and the angular field of view for each camera system; and
- data regarding the relationship between the focus and the depth of field for each camera system.

Support for these amendments may be found throughout the application as filed, including Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0019] and [0026] to [0030], among other places.

Paff does not teach or suggest using master/slave mappings to calculate the parameters for the slave camera systems such that the size of the target object is substantially the same in the images from all of the camera systems. In addition, it does not teach that the master/slave mappings include calibration data regarding (i) the geometric relationship of the camera systems to the scene; (ii) the relationship between the zoom and the angular field of view for each camera system; and (iii) the relationship between the focus and the depth of field for each camera system.

Also, the secondary references cited in the Office Action, Jain and Hobson, also fail to disclose these features.

Therefore, claim 1, as well as claims 2-9 and 42 depending therefrom, are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references.

Claims 10-27 and 43-44 have been cancelled.

The other pending independent claims (i.e. claims 28 and 40) have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Therefore, for analogous reasons, independent claims 28 and 40, as well as their respective dependent claims, are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to the

undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below in order that the Examiner's concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

Date: Aug. 31, 2005

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON GRAHAM LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Ph. (412) 355-6342
Fax (412) 355-6501